Ayala, Joseph

1

To:	MICHAEL K (SNET); 'jhoward@cromor.com'; 'dsasse@cromor.com'
Cc:	WARD-COLE, A JOYCE (SWBT)
Subject:	REVISED 5/30/01 BRPOR Issues Matrix

BRPOR Issue Matrix
(HANDOUT 05...   TO ALL CLECs participating in the BRPOR Collaborative:

Consistent with the revised 5/30/01 Business Rules POR, SBC has updated the
BRPOR Issues Matrix with new responses (NR). This BRPOR Issues Matrix was
also filed with the FCC on 5/30/01. This file was inadvertantly left off
the previous list of files (see email below).

Attached is the BRPOR Issues Matrix (HANDOUT 053001)
<<BRPOR Issue Matrix (HANDOUT 053001).doc>>

Patrick Halbach
Area Manager - OSS Policy and Planning
Office: 214-858-0975
Pager: 888-766-7039
Text Page to: 7667039@mobilemessage.com
Fax: 214-858-0384

> -----Original Message-----
> From: GAMBLE, YVONNE E (SWBT)
> Sent: Friday, June 01, 2001 3:40 PM
> To: jmilnor@uswest.com; Dennis.Kelley@Reconex.com;
> ksmoot@21STCENTURY.com; marianne.mcallister@allegiancetelecom.com;
> Steve.Taff@allegiancetelecom.com; ameris@amerivoice.com;
> Daryl.D.Schulz@accenture.com; Michael.R.Garner.II@alltel.com; ALVAREZ,
> DIANE (ASI); GONZALEZ, DONNA M (ASI); PRIEST, MATTHEW JASON (ASI); SHINE,
> JOAN L (ASI); GARCIA, LEE A (ASI); SCHRIEVER, MARK (ASI); DUNCAN, NORMA
> L (ASI); ZAVALA, SYLVIA A (ASI); ZUCKERMAN, EDWARD X. (AIT); BUNCH,
> RICHARD (ASI); alalvarez@att.com; vanderpol@att.com; davis@lga.att.com;
> rwquinn@att.com; chris_iacovelli@bigfoot.com; davidtownsend@att.com;
> gmack@lga.att.com; klavalle@jw.com; maquion@att.com; mwitcher@lga.att.com;
> pcoughlan@att.com; rbrauchle@att.com; rratner@att.com;
> deyoung@ems.att.com; sfriedman@att.com; connolly@csusa.net;
> tonyawilson@att.com; kmarshall@atgi.net; ebrown@bbo.com; jelmore@bbo.com;
> pautry@bbo.com; mwagner@birch.com; shassan@birch.com; tmoore@birch.com;
> drichards@connectsouth.com; kgoss@connectsouth.com;
> bruce.bennett@corecomm.com; mary.cegelski@corecomm.com;
> sunil.saigal@corecomm.com; thomas.o'brien@corecomm.com;
> bszafran@covad.com; kschwart@covad.com; Cynthia.Fletes@cox.com;
> Kathy.Holland@cox.com; yvette.brown@espire.net; jpowell@excel.com;
> Stephen.Kidd@fbcc.com; alotz@global-com.com; gzink@global-com.com;
> george@hsrreporting.com; pjenkins@intermedia.com;
> hsiegel@IP-communications.net; jgentry@IP-communications.net;
> lcasey@ip.net; kelly.wehrenberg@logixcom.com; cstevens1@mpowercom.com;
> tmontemayer@mantiss.com; msprague@McLeodUSA.com; kmoore@nightfire.com;
> mubeen@nightfire.com; SSimmons@Nightfire.com; rmitchell@northpoint.net;
> slanderson@northpoint.net; tomw@ntscom.com; chaynes@nuvox.com;
> slively@nuvox.com; ddume@pacwest.com; nbenedic@pacwest.com;
> jgrimes@rewireit.com; Julie@rewireit.com; ssierlecki@quintessent.net;
> anitatr@earthlink.net; alopez@rhythms.net; bbaltz@rhythms.net;
> jayala@rhythms.net; stenerelli@rhythms.net; bmcnatt@sagetelecom.net;
> dbasta@sagetelecom.net; mprice@sagetelecom.net; rclarkson@sagetelecom.net;
> bryant.smith@mail.sprint.com; carol.a.davis@mail.sprint.com;
> gary.g.keltner@mail.sprint.com; james.r.davis@mail.sprint.com;
> karen.j.burks@mail.sprint.com; lisa.gritt@mail.sprint.com;
> lori.a.workman@mail.sprint.com; pam.chanay@mail.sprint.com;

> pat.j.ross@mail.sprint.com; jblack@swteleconnect.com;
> mtyoung@telcordia.com; nthomps1@telcordia.com; dpayette@telcordia.com];
> mita.banerjee@teligent.com; marlon.buggs@teligent.com;
> Pamela.Sherwood@twtelecom.com; Susan.Bateman@twtelecom.com;
> c-David.Burley@wcom.com; dennis.guard@wcom.com; gail.grenier@wcom.com;
> james.r.devries@wcom.com; john.trofimuk@wcom.com;
> Karen.a.coleman@wcom.com; lezlee.l.emory-cherrix@wcom.com;
> c-linda.reed@wcom.com; lisa.youngers@wcom.com; micki.jones@wcom.com;
> Becky.Oliver@wcom.com; roseann.kendall@wcom.com; Terri.Mcmillon@wcom.com;
> evdoty@nextlink.com; michelle.ewton@xo.com; HADLEY, KIM L. (AIT); JONES,
> BERNADINE X. (AIT); KAGAN, DENISE V. (AIT); STUTTGEN, HOLLY A. (AIT);
> WEIDES, CHERYL R. (AIT); WIERZBICKI, TESS (AIT); WILSON, LOIS (AIT);
> Neighbors, Sharon L. (AAS); CHOY, VICTORIA (PB); GRAVES, LOUISE (PB);
> JACKSON, CORA J (PB); ROSS, SCOTTIE E (PB); WONG, WINNIE H (PB); ALMAS,
> BENNIE (SWBT); AQUADRO, KAREN (SWBT); BAKER, SANDRA K (SBCSI); BEARDEN,
> BRIAN O (SBCSI); BOWLES, ANTHONY W (SBCSI); BOZADA, DEBORAH A (SWBT);
> BRUNDAGE, BRENDA M (SWBT); BEAN, GRETCHEN (SWBT); Cartwright, David G
> (Sbc-Msi); COX, LORI E (SWBT); DALTON, LAURIE L (SWBT); DICARLO, BENJAMIN
> (SWBT); Dickinson, Derek (Legal); MCFARLAND, J D (SWBT); DUGAN, DONNA L
> (AIT); GALLAGHER, CHRISTOPHER R (SBCSI); GAMBLE, YVONNE E (SWBT); GETZ,
> JIM H. (AIT); Gilles, Tim (AIT); HALBACH II, PATRICK K (SWBT); Heimann,
> Christopher M (Legal); rljaco2@pacbell.com; LAWSON, BETH (SWBT); MARGRAVE,
> JEFFREY (PB); MARTY, LORI (SWBT); MCDONALD, VICKI L (AIT); MUELLER MORAN,
> CLAIR (SWBT); MOSLEY, BILLY R (SWBT); NICKOLOTSKY, DANIEL S (SWBT);
> PAULSMEYER, DEBORAH A(DEBBY (SWBT); PAYNE, BRADLEY (SWBT); SIRLES, GLEN R
> (SBC-MSI); SMITH, JOHN R (SWBT); SWALLER, KATHERINE C (Legal); Syeles,
> Albert M (Snetcomm); THOMAS, SUNNY L (SWBT); TOPPS, MONET (SWBT);
> TOWNSEND, RHONDA L (SWBT); VILLA, YOLANDA (PB); WILSON, STEVE (SWBT);
> WATKINS, HELEN L (SWBT); WALKER, MICHAEL K (SNET); jhoward@cromor.com;
> dsasse@cromor.com
> Cc: WARD-COLE, A JOYCE (SWBT)
> Subject: REVISED 5/30/01 Business Rules Plan of Record - Posted to
> SBC CLEC ONLINE WEBSITE
>
> TO ALL CLECs participating in the BRPOR CLEC Collaborative:
>
> This is to advise you that SBC, pusuant to its obligation under the Merger
> Conditions, filed a Revised Business Rules Plan of Record with the FCC May
> 30, 2001. This message is to inform you that the revised Plan was posted
> to the SBC CLEC OnLine Website as of May 30, 2001. The cover letter sent
> to the FCC was posted as of today June 1, 2001.
>
> All documents are available for viewing and downloading. The URL to
> access the documents is: http//:sbc.clec.com --click on-- SBC | AMERITECH
> MERGER RELATED INFO --scroll down to-- Plan of Record (POR) Documents
> --click on-- Business Rules Plan of Record.
>
> The documents are as follows:
>
> Business Rules POR Cover Letter
>
> INDEX of BR POR Filenames (053001)
>
> BR POR (Revised 053001)
> "Business Rules Plan of Record"
>
> Attachment A (revised 053001)
> "Plan of Record - LSOG 5 - 13 State LSOR Requirements Information"
>
> Attachment B (revised 053001)
> "Fields made Uniform as part of U&E POR"
>
> Attachment C (revised 053001)
> "Fields with Product or Regulatory Driven Differences"

```
>
> Attachment D (revised 053001)
> "Fields to be made Uniform"
>
> Attachment E (revised 053001)
> "Other Fields"
>
> NCNCI Attachment F 052401
> "Ordering Code Set Regional Differences - NC/NCI Code Analysis"
>
> USOCS Attachment F 052501
> "Ordering Code Set Regional Differences - Product Family - USOC Analysis"
>
> FIDS Attachment F 052301
> "Ordering Code Set Regional Differences - FID Analysis"
>
> JEOPREV 052401
> "Illustrates the uniform codes and mapping of PMO to FMO for each region,
> with PIA Codes"
>
> JEOPDETAIL 052401
> "Associated Network Codes, short description with responsible party
> designation"
>
> AIT 12 Month View (053001)
> "12 Month Implementation View"
>
> PB-NB 12 Month View (053001)
> "12 Month Implementation View"
>
> SNET 12 Month View (053001)
> "12 Month Implementation View"
>
> SWBT 12 Month View (053001)
> "12 Month Implementation View"
>
>
> Yvonne E. Gamble
> Area Manager - OSS Program Management
> Industry Markets
> Office:        214.858.0946
> Pager:         888.431.7559
> Text Pager:    4317559@archwireless.net
> Fax:       214.858.0384
>
>
```

SBC Business Rules POR Collaborative Issues List (Handout)

CLEC OSS Issues List *(See Legend at bottom of document)*

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
1	(UPOR CAT IV issue 3) The Merger Condition documents calls for SBC to develop common business rules applicable to CLEC's requests for local service. Such business rules and processes are completing missing from the POR. ***AT&T comment from 2/8/01 transcript to issue #3:*** AT&T wanted to bring up some overall issues, to assure that there was an opportunity within the confines of the Category IV Data Collaborative to share their viewpoints, so that SBC would have the benefit of their input on the issues they consider to be the most critical that the collaborative was to have addressed. The focus of the Category IV Data Collaborative has to do with the obligation to develop uniform business rules across the 13 states. We have had a lot of the discussion at an individual data element level of where an issue has appeared, but I think it's important to take a broader view and step back and share with you our perspective. AT&T is concerned that the extent or the use of state specific conditions for individual preorder and ordering fields is inconsistent with SBC's obligation to introduce uniform business rules. AT&T is concerned about specific conditions that impact whether a field is used at all, whether the field is conditional, optional, required or prohibited. What the choices are to validate entries, where valid entries are identified, and what the data characteristics and format can be when valid entries are not identified.	Birch Telecom	Ordering Other / (Overview-Scope)	NR	During SBC's discussion of detailed attributes of PMO and FMO this will be covered by the SBC proposal. 5/15 - Parties agree to TA in that data provided in Category I- IV data will provide the detail to resolve the issue. 10/31/00 – Held for Category IV Collaborative. 11/8/00 – SBC clarified the document that will be provided for format equivalent to LSOR, and LSPOR. This will include error information as well. Parties agree to leave HC4. 2/20/01- AT&T requested that text from issue #724 be CD and added to this issue #3. Parties agreed. 2/21/01 – Paragraph 28 of the SBC Merger Conditions required SBC to provide an overall assessment of, among other things, its business rules in developing and deploying uniform OSS interfaces. Paragraph 28 does not, however, require SBC to develop common business rules for LSRs; that is required by paragraph 31. Indeed, paragraph 28 acknowledges that CLECs cannot take full advantage of common OSS until the Business Rules Plan of Record is complete. Nevertheless, SBC has sought to achieve significant uniformity in the business rules for CLEC LSRs in the Cat IV data. 2/21/01 – AT&T requested SBC clarify the interpretation of data formatting specifications. Change status to AIR. 2/23/01 – What SBC meant by "data formatting specifications" was that the same version of mechanization specifications (eg. ELMS 5, T1.265-1999, ANSI X.12) would be utilized across all regions for the formatting and exchange of data between SBC and its CLEC trading partners. 4/20/01 - SBC agrees that it will address the topics contained in this issue as part of the Business Rules POR and that CLECs will not be precluded from raising this issue at that time.

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
2	(UPOR CAT IV issue 59) CLECs require data element synchronization for integrating pre-order and order information. 2/20/01 - AT&T asked if order elements change as a result of Business Rules POR, will SBC still maintain synchronicity with PreOrder output? WCOM also asked for continued synchronizing between the PreOrder, Order, and Acknowledgement process.	AT&T	PreOrder / (FMO-PO)	RPA	SBC does not agree. 4/26 - Based AT&T's clarification in collaborative this issue would be same as #49. 5/9 – redline language provided in POR sent out 5/8. 5/19 – Temporary change to AIR from TA. SBC to determine if synchronization applies directly to GUIs and if so what is timing of synchronization. 5/19 – SBC cannot yet determine whether synchronization can be done at same time for preorder and order. Parties agree to change to DO. 6/9 – CLECs revised status to OS. SBC requests rationale behind status change. 6/19 – SBC's proposed language changes submitted to CLECs on 6/19 are pending CLEC review for closure on the 6/23 conf call. (POR FMO section B) B.Pre-ordering A single, uniform, application to application pre-ordering interface accessible using either EDI or CORBA protocols will be implemented (SBC/Ameritech will offer both protocols throughout the 13 state region). This interface version will be available for all SBC/Ameritech service areas, and will represent a new version of the application to application interfaces currently existing in all service areas. The uniform pre-ordering application to application interface which will utilize EDI and CORBA will be referred to as the "application to application interface" in the remainder of this pre-ordering section of this plan. **To further facilitate integration, the data elements in the uniform pre-ordering application to application interface will be synchronized to the extent possible with the data elements in the uniform application to application ordering interface. SBC will provide documentation describing business rules for any fields that cannot be synchronized.** Pre-order response time performance will be measured by SBC/Ameritech with respect to the different technology frameworks i.e. GUI and EDI/CORBA. The pre-ordering

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
					measuring systems will be developed and implemented in proceedings at the state level that address performance measurement and reporting requirements.
					6/30 – Parties agreed to change status to TA.
					10/31/00 – Held for Category IV Collaborative.
					11/7/00 – Related to #83b.
					2/20/01 – AT&T raised new issue...
					AT&T asked if order elements change as a result of BPOR, will SBC still maintain synchronicity with PO output? WCOM also wanted the synchronizing between the PreOrder, Order, and Acknowledgement process.
					2/21/01 - By implementing the changes presented and the alterations agreed to in other issues, SBC has synchronized to the extent possible the data elements in the uniform, LSOG 5, pre-ordering applications with the corresponding ordering fields.
					2/21/01 – SBC's response did not address the 2/20 new issue. SBC to respond. Change status to AIR.
					3/01/01 - It is SBC's intent to maintain synchronization between pre-order responses and order requirements to the extent reasonably possible.
					4/20/01 - SBC agrees that it will address the topics contained in this issue as part of the Business Rules POR and that CLECs will not be precluded from raising this issue at that time.
					5/17/01 – SBC recommends CLOSED DUPLICATE to Issue #17.
					5/17/01 – Parties could not agree and decided to just show Issue 2 is related to Issue 17. This issue remains open.
3	(UPOR CAT IV issue 103) (103) Describe any region-specific ordering differences for updating the E-911 database. (92) Additional information must be included under the "Uniform Ordering Message Flow" to provide detailed	AT&T MCIW	Order / (FMO)	CA	5/19 – Parties agree to TA in that data provided in Category I- IV data will provide the detail to resolve the issue. 11/8/00 – Recommend a CLOSED DUPLICATE issue #365 to this issue #103. Parties agreed. 2/20/01- AT&T expressed its concern that the requirement of sending an address in Pacific Bell whenever SBC is asked to

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
	descriptions of how Listings and/or E-911 information will be provided in each region.				do the E911 update will impact dropping address requirement on migrations.
					3/1/01 - SBC has not found an effective way to alter the Pacific E911 process to avoid the necessity to populate address. To take advantage of carrying over and updating the E911 information through the LSR process, valid address entries will be required.
					4/20/01 – Upon further review, SBC has determined that it can alter the E911 process as follows:
					SBC will enable 911 without requiring the CLEC to pass address on the LSR for a conversion request for PacBell where there are no changes to the (service address of the) end user account. SBC will allow for the conversion of (the) directory listings without requiring an address when no changes are being made to the listing for PacBell. When changes are being made to the listing address, information will be required. SBC will implement this functionality to be effective with a release installed October 20, 2001. SBC agrees it will not seek any extension of the October 20, 2001 date, and that if it obtains an extension of any other OSS release dates, they will not affect the October 20, 2001 E911 release date. To reiterate, this enhancement would not require an address to be populated by CLECs on the Local Service Request in order for PacBell to maintain the E911 information on a conversion from PacBell Retail to UNE-P. CLECs would still need to populate the ECC field with its appropriate value. SBC will eliminate the ECC field requirement as part of the Business Rules Plan of Record.
					5/16/01 – Upon further review, SBC has designed a process that eliminates the need for the ECC field to be used to trigger the E911 process. Further, SBC has designed a process that will not require a pub indicator in the feature field for conversions from retail or resale to UNE-P. The Pub or Non-Pub indicator is still required for new activity as well as some change activity. Both of these enhancements will be implemented with the fundamental changes in the E911 process in October 20, 2001.
					5/17/01 – AT&T feels the agreement that was reached was to occur in October 2001. For other information, see related

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
					issue #70. Parties agree to CLOSE AGREE.
4	(UPOR CAT IV issue 148) Ameritech's unsolicited 865 transaction causes CLECs unnecessary time and expense to trace and review Ameritech order handling errors. What actions will Ameritech take to cease generating the unsolicited 865s?	AT&T	Order / (FMO-Prov)	ADC	It is anticipated that there will always be reasons for an unsolicited message to be sent. The appropriate data will be included, i.e. PON, that will allow the CLEC to associate the response to the appropriate request. 5/19 - Parties agree to TA in that data provided in Category I- IV data will provide the detail to resolve the issue. 10/31/00 – Held for Category IV Collaborative. 11/8/00 – AT&T will provide to language Thursday 11/9 to close this issue. 11/10/00 – Did agreement for AIT 865 apply to Phase I or phase II? SBC clarified it is addressed in Phase II. AT&T prepared and distributed a handout that contained an agreed to approach to Unsolicited 865 transactions. See following: SBC's design commitment for Provider Initiated Transactions ("Unsolicited 865") 11/10/00 In its interest to cooperatively improve processing of CLEC orders, SBC will implement Provider Initiated Transactions to notify CLECs of necessary changes that have been made to previously-confirmed orders. This is a practice of Ameritech that SBC has elected to deploy in all SBC operating territories. ♦ SBC will provide the Purchase Order Number (PON) and Version (VER) of the most currently processed LSR in its transaction so that the appropriate data will be included that will allow the CLEC to associate the 865 to the appropriate LSR in its system. ♦ In the design and operation of the work center processes it employs to create the 865s, SBC will ensure that its representatives consider order supplements that may also relate to the confirmation being modified and accommodate changes made by those supplements in the 865 notice. ♦ SBC work centers staff will endeavor to keep 865 transactions to the minimum level necessary to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the 865 notification process. ♦ SBC will provide for coding the transactions with a clear and unambiguous indicator(s) reflecting the underlying reason for

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
	`. .`				the change in order confirmation. The codes will assist SBC and CLECs in administering the performance measurements that relate to confirmations, jeopardies and the timeliness of 865s. E.g., codes assigned to jeopardy conditions for due date changes would be distinguishable from those for telephone number changes; codes for changes in service order numbers would be distinguishable from those for circuit number changes. ♦ SBC will work collaboratively with the CLECs in the Phase III Category IV collaboratives in developing the underlying reason coding scheme consistent with industry standards and CLEC needs for information about the underlying reasons for the transactions. Refinements and changes in reason codes and 865 processes that arise in the future would be proposed and implemented consistent with the Change Management Process. 11/20/00 – Parties agree to hold to Category IV Collab. 2/16/01 - OBF Local Response Practice 099, LSOG 5 supports the use of the "Unsolicited 865 Transaction" by using fields associated with a "Provider Initiated Response" (PIA). As part of the Local Response Notification, the PIA process was covered in collaborative meetings 2/7-2/8. OBF proposed a list of four codes as valid entries for the PIA field which would allow for **(1)** ECCKT/TN changes, **(2)** Due Date changes, **(3)** a combined ECCKT/Due Date change, and **(4)** Other. (Note: "TN" portion of valid entry 1 was added by SBC.) SBC's position is that the valid entry (1) ECCKT/TN change could in fact be used in the Local Response (FOC) process to advise the CLECs when an ECCKT/TN had to be changed after the FOC had been sent. When this type of change is necessary, a subsequent FOC would be generated with the PIA indicator and refreshed to reflect the new ECCKT/TN. SBC also determined that valid entry (4) Other was obscure and that specific valid entries should be introduced to replace valid entry "Other" and that (4) would not be used in SBC.

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
					Valid entries 2 and 3 from the OBF guideline indicated a Provider Initiated Due Date Change. SBC determined that a due date change should be handled via a Jeopardy process rather than the PIA process since the due date of the request was impacted. Therefore, under the local response for Jeopardy in the Reason Code field, a valid entry of **3J** is being introduced to advise of a due date change via the Jeopardy process.

Additionally, in place of the "Other", a list of proposed PIA Codes (listed under Issue 711) was provided to the CLECs on 2/9/01 for their review and feedback to add or eliminate proposed PIA Codes. Once agreement is reach, these will be presented to OBF for inclusion into the guideline.

2/20/01 – AT&T agrees with the approach not to employ the use of PIA. AT&T is still awaiting the jeopardy reason codes. When they see the PMO info they will be able to come back to close 148. Leave as NR.

2/23/01 – SBC still feels there are time when a PIA process will be necessary therefore some proposed changes have been made to the PIA process - see Issue 711(2/22/01) for an updated list of codes.
PIA 1 was changed removing the TN portion moving it to the jeopardy list.
PIA 9 also was removed moving it to the jeopardy list as well.
PIA 10 was remove entirely and will be discussed further in the CLEC User Forums.
SBC is also providing list of Jeopardy Codes (PMO and FMO) for CLEC review. FMO will be uniform across 13-states.

2/23/01 – AT&T would like additional PIA codes that could be sent when a reject was sent in error (thus taking back the reject). This would eliminate a phone call exchange.
SBC agreed to take a look at this request. Change status to |

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
	⋮				AIR. Additionally, when a pending SUPP has been reviewed and a PIA is in progress but not sent, if the SUPP has not corrected the PIA issue. SBC would send the SUPP as received and still send the PIA so that the CLEC can easily pick up the change. 3/1/01- A Provider Initiated Activity (PIA), using the OBF and FMO definition, indicates a response that is not the result of a customer LSR or supplement, prior to completion. Since a reject is in response to a LSR or supplement, a PIA to undo the reject would not be appropriate. Instead, once an erroneous reject is discovered, SBC proposes providing a FOC with an indicator to advise the CLEC that the FOC replaces a reject in error. This would be done using the third character of the EC VER field. A third character of U to indicate "Confirmation – Replaces Reject in Error" will be added as valid for the Firm Order Confirmation and Directory Only Confirmation. Additionally, when a PIA is in process and a CLEC supplement is sent, SBC will process the supplement as received. The PIA change, if not included in the supplement, will be sent under a separate FOC containing the PIA information, so that it can be tracked and handled more easily by the CLEC. 3/6/01 – Related to 778 which has handout that covers PMO and FMO. AT&T asked what set of Jeopardy and PIA codes will be used in FMO. 3/21/01 – The handout for Issue 778 covers codes for PMO for each region and FMO (13 state) for Jeopardy Notifications and Provider Initiated Activity (PIA). SNET PMO for Jeopardy Notifications was added to the handout in the 3-12 revision. 3/27/01 – WCOM requested this issue be CLOSED AGREED.

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
					4/20/01 - SBC agrees to validate the jeopardy codes to ensure completeness and appropriate use of OBF codes where applicable. SBC will discuss the jeopardy codes in the Business Rules POR collaborative sessions. SBC recognizes that the CLECs have not waived any claims with regards to this issue in the Business Rule POR. SBC agrees to add jeopardy code 1L (Frame Due Time cannot be met) as a valid code.

SBC will not return verbiage with 3B code. SBC agrees to investigate alternate codes to 3B, which will provide more specific information concerning what needs to be corrected.

5/11/01 - Jeopardy Code 1L is now reflected on the Jeopardy Code handout.

Jeopardy Code 3B description has been revised to say "Facilities-Busy/Defective/Incorrect/Incompatible". It is anticipated that this would be a situation to be resolved by SBC. Code "3K Facilities Order Incomplete" and "3L Wiring Problem" has been added, again for SBC resolution.

5/15/01 – A code has also been added for CLEC action "Busy CFA – Send Supp". Jeopardy Handout has also been updated and re-distributed.

5/15/01 – AT&T felt that parties had reached agreement on codes and request the status change to ADC for the documentation changes. |
| 5 | (UPOR CAT IV issue 473)
CLECs request that SBC either compare and cleanup all of its databases to match the uniformly defined valid values, OR expand valid value list for ordering to accept what SBC provides CLEC on the PreOrder returned fields. CLECs are concerned about their ability to figure out what is contained in the un-fielded feature/feature detail field. With a consolidated USOC/FID list, then separate fields would be less of an issue.
(related in concept to 489, 491, 492, and 495) | AT&T CoreCom m SPRINT | General | NR | 2/23/01 – SBC is not planning to alter any data in back end systems containing Feature Feature Detail. This data will be returned in response to uniform queries. The data will be no less usable than it is today.

To the extent it is a business rule pertaining to LSRs, we will address that in the Business Rules POR.

4/20/01 - SBC will provide a listing of USOCs in AIT by July 31, 2001 as an interim aid to assist CLECs. SBC will also create a USOC utilization tool, based on discussion with CLECs regarding the nature of that tool, to provide on-line search capabilities for SBC USOCs across its 13-states. SBC will provide this tool by June 30, 2002, unless SBC is required to adopt uniform USOCs in the Business Rules POR |

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
	¡ ꞏ				proceedings. SBC agrees that CLECs have not waived any claims with regard to this issue in the Business Rule POR.
					5/17/01 – SBC will be taking back issues (#142, 143, 144, 145, 146, and 147) related to USOC and FID analysis. Parties agree to change status to AIR.
					5/23/01 – Attachment F has been updated. SBC still does not see enough commonality or compression to warrant a move to uniform USOCs. Further, SBC still feels a masking solution is not in any party's interest. SBC is prepared to create a USOC utilization tool.
6	(UPOR CAT IV issue 547) Ordering – LSR form – BAN1 Is it possible to move to a default that is populated in the BAN1 field based on a company profile on a 13 state basis?	AT&T	Order	CA	3/1/01 - At this time the PB/NB BAN assignment process will not permit an optional entry. In addition, despite the upgrades already made to the AIT BAN assignment process through the CUF, it does not appear that SBC will be able to modify the BAN assignment processes in a time frame that would permit options to be included as part of requirements for the uniform release. SBC will need to modify the BAN1 data matrix to show C conditional for PB/NB/AIT.
					3/7/01 – AT&T requested that this remain AIR with the outstanding question of whether this will be addressed in the BRPOR. SBC will also note it as an ADC.
					3/21/01 – SBC is working to modify BAN assignment to allow for TABLE/PROFILE defaults, however the embedded process currently in place in the PB/AIT regions cannot be redesigned to offer default BAN implementation for 13-state uniform. SBC is continuing to work BAN assignment actively as part of the CLEC User Forum process. SBC will ensure that the outcome of the CLEC user forum creates a process similar to the default BAN process.
					3/27/01 – WCOM requested this issue be CLOSED AGREED.
					4/20/01 - SBC agrees to implement a uniform process for the use of the BAN1 as part of the Business Rules POR.
					5/11/01 - This field is included on Attachment D of the BRPOR.
					5/17/01 – AT&T requested how SWBT is using this today. What criteria is being used. Change to AIR.
					5/17/01 – SBC explained that the 3 fields in the LSR (REQ

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
					TYP, CC, and LATA) drive to select the appropriate BAN from the table/profile. This table is established based on CLEC provided information on CLEC Profile. Parties agreed to CLOSE AGREE.
7	(UPOR CAT IV issue 557) Ordering – LSR form – AFA field CLECs request that the Account Feature Activity (AFA) field be eliminated? Can AIT derive the information that is provided from other information on the LSR, in lieu of using this AFA field?	AT&T	Order	CA	2/1/01 – Under Investigation 2/15/01 - No the fields cannot be eliminated as they provide for functionality of applying features at an account level, which is applicable in the AIT region. Features/services such as, suspend of entire account, 9-1-1 Locator ID, and calling plans, are done at the account level. 3/7/01 – AT&T inquired about the line level vs account level difference in AIT to see if this would be addressed in the BRPOR. Parties agree to mark AIR. 3/21/01 - SBC will continue to support ACCOUNT FEATURE/ACCOUNT FEATURE DETAIL fields for AIT. Usage of these fields provides increased functionality for the CLEC as they *do not have to input the specific features* for every TN that may be included under the ATN. SBC is investigating the use of this field for 13-state uniformity as part of the Business Rules Plan of Record (BRPOR). 5/11/01 - Field will be made uniform as indicated in Attachment D Supplemental handout and discussed during the collaborative. 5/17/01 – Implementation will be of the AFA field as it is today in AIT but in all regions. Parties agree to CLOSE AGREE.
8	(UPOR CAT IV issue 597) Ordering – PS form – BLOCK field Why did SBC choose to move the valid entries from the Blocking field to Feature Feature Detail? How many valid values are there out of blocking that went to Feature Detail for 13 states?	WCOM AT&T	Order	NR	2/15/01 - SBC FMO is the 13 state uniform suggestion. IF the CLEC community chooses we could also implement as follows, allowing for regional product differences. The alternative to the 13-state BLOCK entries, is to revert to OBF valid data elements. This would result in nonuniformity in the field, with regional differences. The following is the proposal to be as similar among regions as possible: Entry Region Definition A 13 state No collect/Third party

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:		
					B	13 State	No third party
					C	13 state	No Collect
					F	PB/CT/SWBT	No 1+, 0+ (including 900/976)
					G	CA/CT	No 011 + dialing
					H	SWBT/CT	No directory assistance call completion
					K	NV/CT	No 900
					M	SWBT/CA	No 900/976
					S	CA	No 976, No 900-303, No 900-505
					W	CA	No 900-303
					N	CT	No per use 3-way calling
					O	CT	No charging to originating number
					T	CT	Inhibit Automatic Call Back
					U	CT	Inhibit Automatic Recall
					V	CT	Inhibit Call Trace

3/7/01 – WCOM indicated that they had submitted CCR through CMP for the block field requesting the use of "N" for No Casual Calling. This was related to CLECS 99-176. It is currently pending implementation. Based on SBC's plan "N" is shown as used for something else. Also the use of other valid entries do not coincide with OBF. CLECs requested that SBC utilize the valid entries presented by OBF where possible for the same blocking features. It was also mentioned that SBC had already committed to providing in the LSOR information relative to the blocking features to note when a USOC is required in the Feature field. Parties agreed to AIR.

3/21/01 - SBC revised the table above into a handout. The handout represents the proposed usage by SBC regions of the OBF recognized entries with the exception of the AIT region. AIT will utilize USOCs in the Feature/Feature Detail for block activity as defined in AIT LSOG 4. AIT will be altered with the Business Rules Plan of Record (BRPOR).

4/20/01 - SBC agrees to implement a uniform process for the

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
	! .				Blocking field as part of the Business Rules POR. SBC agrees to provide uniform block values and a uniform use of the blocking field across 13 states(consistent with OBF guidelines or standards). SBC will return all Block values (in the Block field) with the pre-order CSI inquiry capability.
					4/20/01 - SBC agrees to return all block values with the pre-order CSI inquiry capability. SBC will eliminate any inconsistency between pre-ordering and ordering with respect to blocking.
					5/17/01 – WCOM requested SBC to update LSOR with Block values that also require additional USOCs to initiate the service. For example, CLECs want table added to BLOCK field in LSOR for such cross relationships, that requires CREXN when BLOCK is M. Ensure this table includes 13 states information. Also note related BLOCK update in issue #47.
					Parties agree to CLOSE AGREE.
					5/1701 – Issue raised as to whether if a USOC is needed on the feature detail field, will the USOCs be uniform across all regions in addition to uniformity of the data in the BLOCK field. AT&T requested a list of BLOCKs and reasons for the USOCs for CLECs review before closing this issue. Change status to AIR.
					5/23/01 – No, the USOC will not be uniform under current plans. The USOCs are identified by blocking product, by region on Attachment F.
9	(UPOR CAT IV issue 652) DL form & Dir Srvc Request Completion - ALI field (1) Why AT&T has to capture the ALI on a return feed from SNET, when it is applying to a new service on REQTYP A or any new listing. SBC will go back to check how SNET handles ALI field for loops. (2) SBC will also investigate the return of a FOC.	AT&T	Directory Listings / Notifications	1)CA 2)CA	2/7/01 – Under Investigation 2/20/01 – CLECs asked to include Directory Service Request Completion notification for use of the ALI as well as Directory Listings. SBC agreed to address this issue by the use of ALI valid values for both forms. 3/1/01 – 1) The SNET system provides the ALI code to the CLEC, this is why it's input is prohibited in SNET. The ALI code is

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
					needed *for subsequent activity, which is why the CLEC needs to capture it from the notification and store it for future activity.*
					Due to back-end system constraints, *in SNET* for all *listings* where LACT is not LML: Facility Based listings will require the ALI code, but Resale and UNE Port listings will prohibit the ALI code when the LACT is N.
					Conditions on the ALI field will change to:
					The current condition "Required when SC = CT and LACT is not N, otherwise prohibited when SC = CT" will change to 2 conditions:
					Required when SC = CT, REQTYP is not A, B, C or J and LACT is not N, otherwise prohibited when SC = CT and REQTYP is not A, B, C, or J.
					Required when SC/SC1 = CT, REQTYP is A, B, C or J and RTY is not LML, otherwise prohibited when SC/SC1 = CT, REQTYP is A, B, C or J and RTY is LML.
					This issue 652 is related to issue 472.
					2) Based on OBF guidelines, the ALI code is not returned on the Confirmation (FOC) since very little information relative to listings is returned on the FOC, only DLQTYR (Directory Listing Quantity) which is at the LSR level and not at the listing level where the ALI would be used. It is, however, returned on the Directory Service Order Completion notification along with other listing-type information including the actual listing data for a specific DLNUM/ALI.
					3/6/01 – CLECs feel that this is not something they could agree with and would hope this would be addressed with the Business Rules POR. SBC does not feel this issue can be addressed in the scope and time limits of this plan.
					AT&T also wanted to know if this is something that would be covered by BRPOR. Change to AIR.
					3/21/01 – SBC will address this within the Business Rules Plan of Record (BRPOR).
					3/21/01 - SBC plans to make the use of the ALI field uniform

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
	⋮				as part of the Business Rules Plan of Record (BRPOR). 5/15/01 – SBC agrees to make ALI field uniform as part of the BRPOR implementation and did update documentation in Attachment D. 5/16/01 – Parties agree to CLOSE AGREE.
10	(UPOR CAT IV issue 688) DL form – LAZC field 1) Can the listed address on the DL Form become optional FMO when the service address and the listed address are the same? 2) How was PB able to provide this service PMO?	AT&T	Directory Listings	CA	2/8/01 – Under Investigation 2-22-01 - SBC will change to allow the SA to serve as the LA when they are the same and under certain circumstances: LA cannot be an indented address (LTXTY value cannot be ADR") If LTXTY value is ADR, then LASN or LALOC must be populated. LA must be present if EU AFT field is populated. As requirements for this option are completed, other conditions may arise which will be identified in the final documentation. 3/1/01 - SBC will allow the SA to serve as the LA when they are the same and under certain circumstances: LA cannot be an indented address (LTXTY value cannot be ADR). If LTXTY value is ADR, then LASN or LALOC must be populated. LA must be present if EU AFT field is populated. When SC/SC1 is CA or NV, the EU form Service Address data must be provided on ACT V when LUC is Y. 3/6/01 – AT&T requested that this is related back to SASN field on EU form to ensure the rules are the same. SBC to take back as AIR. AT&T also wanted to know if this difference would be addressed by the BRPOR. 3/21/01 - As per Issue 632, the following condition will be changed to correct the reference to LUC: When SC/SC1 is CA or NV, the EU form Service Address data must be provided on ACT V when the DL form is present. 3/21/01 - SBC plans to make the use of the LAZC field uniform as part of the Business Rules Plan of Record (BRPOR).

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
	: .				5/11/01 – SBC was in error in stating that we would make the LAZC field uniform. To clarify, the rules for the LAZC field would not be the same as the SASN field. There are product differences driving the various uses of this field. LAZC is not allowed because the Directory product does not print the zipcode in various regions. During discussion of issue 688, several topics were discussed. SBC intended to state that it would remove certain conditions associated with the SASN fields through the BRPOR.

The requirements for the UPOR show regional differences for the PB region that were derived from Listings Gateway processes. With the BRPOR, SBC removed those conditions as indicated in the Attach D handout to make the use of SASN uniform for Directory Listings.

SBC will update the SASN root cause column of Attach D to read "The Listings Gateway in PB/NB requires the end user address for ACT V when the listing is changing."

5/16/01 – Accenture requested that the last note on BRPOR Directory Revisions HANDOUT (5/16/01) be removed. Parties agree to remove.

Accenture felt 5/11 response was confusing and requested that SBC summarize our discussion and agreement reached in today's collaborative. SBC will change to AIR and draft response for CLECs review.

5/17/01 – SBC clarifies:
If it is a conversion ACT V, where ERL is "N", your Listed address and your Service address do not need to be sent, unless there is a change to the listing address.

5/17/01 – Parties agree to CLOSE AGREE. |
| 11 | (UPOR CAT IV issue 725)
Ordering - PS Form - Feature/Feature Detail field

AT&T comment from transcript:
On another more specific issue, I would prefer as a | AT&T | Ordering | NR | 2/8/01 – Under investigation. Related to PS Form -Feature Feature Detail.

2/23/01 – While SBC may address other differences in the Business Rules POR (BRPOR), Paragraph 31 of the Merger |

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
	separate issue and we would suggest that it go in connection with the form P S port services that we discussed on Tuesday, February 6, 2001. And that is whether or not SBC is moving to a common set of codes and indicators (including Class of Service Codes) or whether fields such as Feature and Feature Detail are really employing an approach where they accumulate the individual business rules peculiar to regions on a PMO basis. The question we would have is to the extent the differences are not being cared for in the development of the rules that we have gone over so far. Is that something that SBC plans to address in the Business Rules Plan of Record? That issue would go in connection with the port service form, the fields would be Feature and Feature Detail. And the question we have is whether or not the region specific conditions that are laid out in PMO, are identified fields. To the extent there are differences from region to region it is not apparent in the FMO whether the catch all reference to the CLEC Handbook is really a shorthand way of saying that those distinctions will carry forward in the FMO.				Conditions requires SBC to establish uniform business rules or a software solution only for local service requests. 3/7/01 – SBC to expand in its response. Change to AIR. 3/21/01 – In response to CLEC requests, SBC has identified certain open issues that will be addressed in the Business Rules Plan of Record (BRPOR). In addition, SBC plans to address in the BRPOR ordering code differences to ensure that CLEC-submitted local service requests are consistent with SBC's business rules, except where the such differences result from product or regulatory differences. Many region-specific conditions governing field usage that refer to the CLEC Handbook result from product and/or regulatory differences. Consistent with paragraph 31 of the Merger Conditions, SBC does not plan to alter those types of conditions. 4/20/01 - SBC will provide a listing of USOCs in AIT by July 31, 2001 as an interim aid to assist CLECs. SBC will also create a USOC utilization tool, based on discussion with CLECs regarding the nature of that tool, to provide on-line search capabilities for SBC USOCs across its 13-states. SBC will provide this tool by June 30, 2002, unless SBC is required to adopt uniform USOCs in the Business Rules POR proceedings. SBC agrees that CLECs have not waived any claims with regard to this issue in the Business Rule POR. 5/11/01 - SBC has identified the fields that would not be made uniform by either SBC recommendation or Product /Regulatory reasons. Those fields are identified in attachments C & E of the BRPOR. Ordering codes will be addressed as described in issue #5. 5/17/01 - AT&T requested an overview of the proposed USOC search tool and whether SBC's plan was to provide the tool on the Toolbar only or as also a function of pre-order (EDI/CORBA). SBC clarified that the tool would only be delivered if SBC was not required to either mask USOCs or fundamentally change USOCs. If either masking or fundamental changes were required, the tool would not be

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
	⟍⟍				built. If, however, the tool was chosen, it would be as robust as it could be. SBC will work to deliver more details regarding the proposed tool for CLEC consideration. Status changed to AIR. 5/23/01 – See response to Issue 5.
12	(UPOR CAT IV issue 728) Local Response – Reject Can SBC provide a matrix of pre-foc, post-FOC, Reject guide that shows when rejects will be returned. This documentation would be helpful LSOR to be more clear. CLECs would like SBC to provide a list of errors for both jeopardies and rejects.	SPRINT	Notifications	CA	2/9/01 – Under Investigation 2/16/01 - Documentation will be updated to include a list of Reject information as will be provided in the ERROR CODE and ERROR MESSAGE fields on the Reject Notification. Similarly, a list of the RCODE (Jeopardy Reason Code) and RDET (Jeopardy Reason Code Detail) valid values will be provided. Reject Notifications will only occur in response to a request or supplement. Documentation will be updated to clarify. 3/7/01 – Parties agree to change to AIR. 3/21/01 - Jeopardy information has been provided both in the data matrices and in the handout for Issue 778. Error number and messages are still being developed based on business rules. Due to the size of this effort these will not be available until the final requirements are due. 4/20/01 - SBC will make a reasonable effort to identify service order generation edits common across the regions and, where applicable, will establish common error messages for those situations. The common edits and SBC's position on which error messages can be made common will be discussed in the Business Rules POR collaborative sessions. SBC agrees that the CLECs have not waived any claims with regards to this issue in the Business Rule POR. 4/20/01 - SBC agrees to validate the jeopardy codes to ensure completeness and appropriate use of OBF codes where applicable. SBC will discuss the jeopardy codes in the Business Rules POR collaborative sessions. SBC recognizes that the CLECs have not waived any claims with regards to this issue in the Business Rule POR. SBC agrees to add jeopardy code 1L (Frame Due Time cannot be met) as a valid

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
					code.
					SBC will not return verbiage with 3B code. SBC agrees to investigate alternate codes to 3B, which will provide more specific information concerning what needs to be corrected.
					5/17/01 – Related to Issue 13 as to REJECTS. Parties agree to CLOSE AGREE as to Jeopardy Codes.
13	(UPOR CAT IV issue 730) Local Response – Reject – (general) Distinguish the first two positions of edit errors to identify if the error message is from MOG, LASR, or REJECT. CLECs also asked whether or not the SD errors should be uniform across all 13 states.	AT&T	Notifications	UI	2/9/01 – Under Investigation This issue is related to issue #359. 2/19/01 – SBC plans to continue the practice of prefixing error messages so that they reflect the systems that are generating the error. These will be reflected in the LSOR documentation. The SD errors are generated by backend systems out of the Order Generator process. In an effort to minimize impact to those processes, SD errors will not be made uniform. However in the AIT region, SBC will be reducing code to move many of the error messages into the LS prefix codes (generated from LASR) based on 13-state uniform business rules. Currently the prefixes listed below are planned. Since requirements are still being developed, some changes may be added. This will be reflected in final documentation. **PREFIX / GENERATED BY** **LS** – LASR **SD** – Order Generation Process **MR** – Manual Rejects from Service Center GUI (Due to the use of LASR GUI in all service centers, this list is being made uniform in all regions. AIT "M" prefix codes will become MR.) **B, G, H, M, T** – Currently AIT error code prefixes. As LASR is implemented as the front-end system, these edits will be moved to LS as appropriate. "M" will be moved into the MR prefix category. 2/21/01 – CLECs requested opportunity to review the draft of the list of errors prior to delivery of the LSOR/LSPOR data and before closing this issue. SBC agreed to see what

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
	: .				information might be available and provide as appropriate prior to LSOR/LSPOR delivery. Status changed to AIR. 3/7/01 – Parties agree to leave to AIR. 3/21/01 - Error number and messages are still being developed based on business rules. Due to the size of this effort these will not be available until the final requirements are due. 4/20/01 - SBC will make a reasonable effort to identify service order generation edits common across the regions and, where applicable, will establish common error messages for those situations. The common edits and SBC's position on which error messages can be made common will be discussed in the Business Rules POR collaborative sessions. SBC agrees that the CLECs have not waived any claims with regards to this issue in the Business Rule POR. 5/17/01 – Parties agree to change to UI.
14	(UPOR CAT IV issue 734) Local Response – Jeopardy Comparison between the use of 2a and the level of detail that is provided for a jeopardy code. Is "Other" an applicable return code? Clarify if special characters are applicable. For circumstances were there is specific action related to a code, are CLECs receptive to SBC creating codes for some specific circumstances?	AT&T Accentur e	Notifications	CA	2/9/01 – Under investigation 2/16/01- 1P is a valid OBF RCODE, indicating Other. SBC proposes it be implemented for FMO, along with the Jeopardy Reason Code (RDET) of "Other". The use of the 1P will be limited, as pre-guideline codes will be added to provide further detail. Along those lines, 2A (LSR Error, Incorrect or Missing Information) will be used but additional non-guideline codes that provide more detail will also be provided and be the preferred ones recommended by our methods and procedures. For example, we will also add a non-guideline code (ie. 3Z) for "Invalid CFA" Valid special characters for the Jeopardy Reason Code Detail (RDET) field are the parenthesis (()) and the virgule (/). 3/21/01 – This is an updated response of 2/16/01 (replacing the 2nd paragraph). Along those lines, SBC has determined that Jeopardy Code 2A (LSR Error, Incorrect or Missing Information) will NOT be used. Additional non-guideline codes that provide more detail will be provided and be the preferred ones

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
	⁝				*recommended by our methods and procedures as needed.* For example, 4E CFA/POI Defective/Busy – Send Supplement. 3/27/01 – WCOM requested this issue be CLOSED AGREED. 4/20/01 - SBC agrees to validate the jeopardy codes to ensure completeness and appropriate use of OBF codes where applicable. SBC will discuss the jeopardy codes in the Business Rules POR collaborative sessions. SBC recognizes that the CLECs have not waived any claims with regards to this issue in the Business Rule POR. SBC agrees to add jeopardy code 1L (Frame Due Time cannot be met) as a valid code. SBC will not return verbiage with 3B code. SBC agrees to investigate alternate codes to 3B, which will provide more specific information concerning what needs to be corrected. . 5/15/01 - SBC agreed it would create a job aid for LSC to limit use of 1P when no other specific code is appropriate. Parties agree to CLOSE AGREE.
15	(UPOR CAT IV issue 778) Notifications – Jeopardy form - RDET field CLECs want SBC to provide *PMO detail list of reason codes by region,* when CLEC receives a 1P jeopardy code.	AT&T	Notifications	CA	2/23/01 – SBC has provided a list of Jeopardy Codes for PMO, AIT March release, FMO Uniform 13-states and Provider Initiated Activity Codes. See Handout provided on 2/23/01. SNET was not available. 3/6/01 – This issue is focused on the PMO data. Parties agree to CLOSE DUPLICATE this to 148. 4/20/01 - SBC agrees to validate the jeopardy codes to ensure completeness and appropriate use of OBF codes where applicable. SBC will discuss the jeopardy codes in the Business Rules POR collaborative sessions. SBC recognizes that the CLECs have not waived any claims with regards to this issue in the Business Rule POR. SBC agrees to add jeopardy code 1L (Frame Due Time cannot be met) as a valid code. SBC will not return verbiage with 3B code. SBC agrees to investigate alternate codes to 3B, which will provide more specific information concerning what needs to be corrected. 5/15/01 – Parties reviewed the 1P codes and requested CLOSE AGREE.

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
16	(WCOM BRPOR issue #1) SBC improperly interprets the Merger Conditions when it states in the BR POR that the business rules "do not establish the actual valid values for ordering specific products and services, which often are defined by backend systems, processes and databases." USOCs and NC/NCI codes are no exception and must be made uniform absent CLECs' concurrence. (See WorldCom letter of April 27, 2001 for additional detail.)	WCOM	I(B) Scope	NR	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/17/01 – In the U&E POR, SBC committed to develop a plan to implement uniform USOCs and NC/NCI codes, except codes that differ due to product or regulatory differences, as part of this POR. Consistent with this commitment, SBC has identified those codes that can be made uniform and developed a plan for doing so that would utilize a software mask. SBC also has identified some of the pros and cons of implementing this plan, and will continue its dialogue with the CLECs on this issue. 5/17/01 – SBC will be continuing its additional review of USOC documentation that relate to new issues raised today (issue #142-147). AT&T asked: On Attach B, are the following fields were prohibited: CC-ACT on PS form, FLOOR on EU and other form, EDDO on DSR form. WCOM asked: Examine the need for further clarity around splitting the fields between the attachments and identifying that fields appear on multiple forms. AT&T asked: Which of the fields on attach B would not have been included if SBC had not included valid entries into its definition of Business Rules. 5/23/01 - SBC has identified the following fields on attachment B that have regional differences in valid values. TGPULSE, CFA, CKR, FEATURE, GIND, GISNO, LST, SGNL, FECKET.
17	(WCOM BRPOR issue #2) Integration of pre-ordering and ordering interfaces is a binding commitment, and is neither "voluntar[y]" nor limited to what is "reasonably possible." (See WorldCom letter of April 27, 2001 for additional detail.)	WCOM	I(B) Scope	NR	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/17/01 – Paragraph 31 of the Merger Conditions does not require synchronization of SBC's preordering and ordering interfaces. In the U&E POR, SBC committed to synchronize the data elements for the preorder and order interfaces, "to the extent possible." SBC's BRPOR is consistent with this commitment.

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
	! .				5/17/01 - SBC will examine a commitment to document the rules around any items that cannot be synchronized. 5/23/01 – SBC proposes add a sentence to the end of the last paragraph in Section I. B., to read: " In addition, should SBC identify, through the development of requirements for this Plan, any fields that cannot be synchronized between preorder and order, it will document those fields and place a note to that effect in both the LSPOR and LSOR."
18	(WCOM BRPOR issue #3) Comprehensive Business Rule Uniformity is mandated by the Merger Conditions. It is not to be implemented selectively, subject to SBC's Cost Benefit Analysis. The only exceptions to uniformity are for product and regulatory differences. (See WorldCom letter of April 27, 2001 for additional detail.)	WCOM	I(C) Process Methodology	RPA	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/17/01 – SBC is unsure to what this statement is directed, but believes that a reasonableness standard necessarily and implicitly is a component of its commitment and the Merger Conditions.
19	(WCOM BRPOR issue #4) SBC's definitions of regulatory and product differences are overbroad. Regulatory differences should include only those differences required by state rules, regulations, statues or other laws. Product differences should include only differences directly caused by a state tariff. (See WorldCom letter of April 27, 2001 for additional detail.)	WCOM AT&T	II(B) Regulatory and Product Differences	NR	5/1/01 – Under Investigation are too narrow, especially its definition of product differences. As stated in the BR POR, SBC believes a product or service is defined by the manner, terms or conditions pursuant to which the product or service is offered. Moreover, the manner, terms and conditions pursuant to which a product or service is offered may be defined in documents other than tariffs, including, for example, interconnection agreements, statements of generally available terms, or other contracts. 5/17/01 – AT&T and WCOM requested augmented documentation of Attachment C entries where such differences are justified by instruments other than tariffs (such as Interconnection Agreements or SGAT). 5/23/01 – Attachment C has been updated.
20	(WCOM BRPOR issue #5) SBC needs to ensure that any CCR in progress or to be implemented in 2001 are not impacted negatively by BRPOR.	WCOM	Overall Issue	NR	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/11/01 – CCRs that are planned to be implemented prior to Uniform Release are being analyzed for inclusion in the Uniform requirements. Further, other CCRs on the CCR list, are being reviewed for either inclusion on the Uniform Release or to determine if the Uniform Release mitigates their

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
					need. To ensure that any CLEC request maintains uniformity, future CCRs will be analyzed for 13 state uniformity prior to release prioritization. 5/17/01 – SBC was requested to look at the merger condition guideline for a forward looking 12-month plan for deployment. **5/24/01** - The 12-month view plan for deployment is available in the CMP section of the CLEC OnLine website, and is also attached as a part of the updated BRPOR filing.
21	(WCOM BRPOR issue #6) Fields LD1, LD2, & LD3 - Attachment D denotes changes by removing regional exceptions. This change must also be effective in related preorder transactions, e.g., Address Validation, TN, xDSL, CSR, etc. due to dependency requirements identified in business rule details. (addition to what SBC identified in Attachment D)	WCOM	Attachment D	ADC	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/8/01 – Related to issue 57. 5/11/01 – For Pre-Ordering, there are no regional exceptions for the LD1, LD2 and LD3 fields. Refer to pre-ordering data matrices released 3/21/01. 5/17/01 – For clarity, these fields are moving from Attachment D to Attachment B. Agreed Documentation Change.
22	(WCOM BRPOR issue #7) AAI field – Attachment D denotes changes by removing regional exceptions. This change must also be effective in related preorder transactions, e.g., Address Validation, TN, xDSL, CSR, etc. due to dependency requirements identified in business rule details. (addition to what SBC identified in Attachment D)	WCOM	Ordering Attachment D	ADC	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/1/01 – WCOM identified this issue is same as their WCOM BRPOR issue #7. 5/11/01 – There are no regional exceptions for the AAI field in the pre-ordering transactions. The following regional note was removed as a result of Issue #433 during the Category IV Collaborative: "If SC = CA or NV, Trailer would be returned in this field instead of the LD1,2, 3 and LV1,2,3 fields, if applicable." The data matrices released 3/21/01 reflect this change. 5/17/01 - Parties agree to ADC
23	(WCOM BRPOR issue #8) CITY field – Should include business rule identical to other service address fields, (i.e., "If CITY is returned in preorder address validation, that data must be populated in this field.")	WCOM	Ordering Attachment D	ADC	5/1/01 – WCOM's SME felt that for issue 8 - CITY field needed a note added for clarification only regarding the blanket preorder population field. Documentation only.
24	(WCOM BRPOR issue #9) *STATE field – does not identify valid values*	WCOM	Ordering Attachment D	ADC	5/1/01 – Regarding #9, WCOM will double check with SME if there was a particular form that the clarification of STATE valid values was needed for.

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
					5/4/01 – WCOM and SBC added the note: "Entry is based on US postal codes." Parties agree to ADC.
25	(WCOM BRPOR issue #10) ZIP field – (1) needs to include business rule identical to other service address fields, (i.e., "If CITY is returned in preorder address validation, that data must be populated in this field.") (2) Also add appropriate business rule(s). If CLEC submits a 12 digit value, SBC will only edit first 5 characters. Related to CAT IV issue #434	WCOM	Ordering Attachment D	ADC	5/1/01 – WCOM requested a documentation change to further clarify the ZIP issue #10. Edit 5 vs. 12 digit and is this particular to the EU form. 5/2/01 - SBC will add a note to read: "If up to 12 char are received, then characters 1-5 will be used and the remainder will not be retained." 5/17/01 - Parties agree to ADC
26	(WCOM BRPOR issue #11) WorldCom needs Tariff references for all product differences that do not have one.	WCOM	Attachment C	NR	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/2/01 – WCOM wants it noted that there needs to be documented to point to some source for justifying that difference for each issue. 5/17/01 – SBC will provide tariff references to the extent applicable. Related to issue 19. Attachment C will be modified accordingly. Change to AIR for CLECs to review language changes. 5/23/01 – SBC updated Attachment C.
27	(WCOM BRPOR issue #12) DFDT -- What about AIT which is not addressed?	WCOM	Attachment C	NR	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/2/01 – SBC indicated this field was a product difference. WCOM requests that SBC provide the tariff cite to Attachment C, since it is referenced in the product difference verbiage. 5/23/01 – AIT has been added to Attachment C verbiage. The difference in field usage is related to SNET. A tariff cite has been provided.
28	(WCOM BRPOR issue #13) FA -- What about SNET?	WCOM	Attachment C	NR	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/11/01 – ATTACHMENT C is being modified and corrected. SNET utilizes Feature/Feature Detail fields as SWBT/AIT do, with a line assignable USOC required on ACT N, T or ACT C with LNA N. 5/17/01 – Accenture questioned what about ACT V and LNA of N? SBC will investigate and update accordingly. 5/18/01 - Change to AIR for CLECs to review language changes. 5/23/01 – SBC updated Attachment C.
29	(WCOM BRPOR issue #14) Feature -- What about SNET	WCOM	Attachment C	NR	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/11/01 – ATTACHMENT C is being modified and corrected. SNET utilizes Feature/Feature Detail fields as SWBT/AIT do,

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
					with a line assignable USOC required on ACT N, T or ACT C with LNA N. 5/17/01 – Accenture questioned what about ACT V and LNA of N? SBC will investigate and update accordingly. 5/18/01 - Change to AIR for CLECs to review language changes. 5/23/01 – SBC updated Attachment C.
30	(WCOM BRPOR issue #15) Feature Detail – a) What about ECC field? b) How is it handled for SNET	WCOM	Attachment C	a)CA b)ADC	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/11/01 - ECC is not used by SNET, this field was only used by PB/NB. SNET updates E911 records from the CRIS/SONAR order for UNE-RS. 5/17/01 – a) Parties agree to CLOSE DUPLICATE b) Parties agree to update Attachment C to include SNET.
31	(WCOM BRPOR issue #16) GIND -- Add "in CT and AIT" if it only applies there.	WCOM	Attachment C	CA	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/2/01 – SBC clarified that product difference for these fields is no longer an issue. WCOM asked to CLOSE AGREE.
32	(WCOM BRPOR issue #17) CSIND -- Add "in CT, AIT, PB" if it only applies there.	WCOM	Attachment C	CA	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/2/01 – SBC clarified that product difference for these fields is no longer an issue. WCOM asked to CLOSE AGREE.
33	(WCOM BRPOR issue #18) JK CODE, NIDR -- Explain note under State Regulatory Difference Column.	WCOM	Attachment C	NR	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/2/01 – SBC explained the state regulatory difference is unique to UNE and only available if CLEC has that language in their Interconnection Agreement. SBC agrees to break out these fields into separate UNE and Resale line items on Attachment C. 5/11/01 – ATTACHMENT C is being modified and corrected. NIDR/JACK CODE for UNE is contractual. Interconnection agreements with stand-alone NIDs can order NIDR for loops but not for UNE-P. All regions offer request for new NID or move of existing NID as a Resale tariffed product offering. OBF has not defined a NIDR field for PORT Service Form, however AIT does offer move of the NIDR as a tariff offering for CPO. The request would require the USOC in the Feature Field. 5/18/01 – Parties agree to make this ADC.

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
					5/18/01 - Change to AIR for CLECs to review language changes. 5/23/01 – NIDR/JK code are OBF fields on the Loop Service Form and the Loop Service with Number Portability form. These fields are prohibited for all SBC regions. OBF has not defined JK code/NIDR for UNE-Port or Port w/Loop. At this time, SBC does not support the request to order or move NID for UNE products. The 5/11/01 statement that AIT offered to move the NIDR was incorrect. SBC does support the request to order or move NID for resold services. This field will be moved from attachment C to attachment B as this field is uniform with the LSOG 5 release. Upon further investigation the statement in the state regulatory column of attachment C "Based on company contract in CA/NV" was incorrect.
34	(WCOM BRPOR issue #19) TC Name, TC OPT, TC To PRI, TC to SEC, TCID, TG TC Name, TG TC OPT, TG TB to PRI, TG TC to SEC, TG TCID -- What about SNET?	WCOM	Attachment C	NR	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/2/01 – Parties identified several cleanup items that need to be corrected. SBC agree to re-review these for cleanup. 5/11/01 – ATTACHMENT C is being modified and corrected. SNET utilizes the same basic TC OPT as PB and AIT. 5/18/01 – Parties agree to ADC. 5/18/01 - Change to AIR for CLECs to review language changes. 5/23/01 – SBC updated Attachment C.
35	(WCOM BRPOR issue #20) TG TC Name -- What is the number of occurrences for SNET? They are listed on the others.	WCOM	Attachment C	NR	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/2/01 – Parties identified several cleanup items that need to be corrected. SBC agree to re-review these for cleanup. 5/17/01 – SNET has no defined limit, but on a routine basis it has accepted up to 12 split referrals. 5/18/01 – Documentation will reflect that SNET will accept up to 12 split referrals. Parties agree to ADC. 5/18/01 - Change to AIR for CLECs to review language changes. 5/23/01 – SBC updated Attachment C.
36	(WCOM BRPOR issue #21) LPIC/PIC(Trks) -- What is the difference and where?	WCOM	Attachment C	NR	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/11/01 - ATTACHMENT C is being modified and corrected. DTU, DTR forms have an LPIC for the TRUNK GROUP and TRUNKS. LPIC(TRKS) is for the (DID) lineside TRUNKS. The digital trunking product offered in PB- CA is a trunkside

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
	(.				offering only and LPIC(TRKS) is not applicable. 5/18/01 – Parties agree to ADC. 5/18/01 - Change to AIR for CLECs to review language changes. 5/23/01 – SBC updated Attachment C.
37	(WCOM BRPOR issue #22) BRO -- What about IN?	WCOM	Attachment C	CA	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/3/01 - Not tarrifed in Indiana, but is used in the same way in all AIT states. WCOM agreed to CLOSE AGREE.
38	(WCOM BRPOR issue #23) DLNM -- What about AR?	WCOM	Directory Attachment C	ADC	5/1/01 – Under Investigation SBC agreed to provide ARK tariff reference? Parties agree documentation change.
39	(WCOM BRPOR issue #24) DML -- Please clarify AIT is listed in both affirmative and negative.	WCOM	Directory Attachment C	ADC	5/1/01 – Under Investigation Documentation will be corrected to remove the second AIT reference since it is offered in AIT. Parties agree to ADC.

40	(WCOM BRPOR issue #25)
	DSUP, EA, LALOC, LASN – Where does this apply?
		WCOM	Attachment C	NR	5/1/01 – Under Investigation
					5/3/01 – Listing descriptions are not clear for the product differences in Attach C. SBC to add clarity.
					5/15/01 – Attachment C has been updated to reflect the regions where these fields apply.
					5/15/01 – SBC clarified the BRPOR Directory Revisions HANDOUT (5/15/01) needs a subtitle to clarify that these extracted fields from Attachment A are "Related to the LSOG5 Uniform Release" so that parties do not misinterpret the handout to apply to BRPOR.
					
					These 4 fields are related to various issues:
					    DSUP related to issue 97
					    EA related to issue 93
					    LALOC related to issue 98
					    LASN related to issue 99
					
					SBC will modify the last that the last condition on DSUP to clarify how DSUP is used in SNET:
					
					    In AIT, ADV field must be present on the previous iteration of the DSR. In SNET, DSUP is allowable when ADV is populated on the previous iteration of the DSR or if a future due date was provided.

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
					AT&T requested the business rule applicable to REQTYP J not be removed as discussed during collab discussion.
					For EA field, being that SBC will be removing EA which is currently only valid for AIT. These changes to accommodate not having EA will be implemented within the BRPOR implementation window. EA will then be updated in the LSOR to show prohibited.
					For LASN field, the Attachment C handout will be updated further for clarity and confirm new language with CLECs before changing to ADC. Related to 99. Cleanup of the conditions to be addressed by Issue 107.
					Overall action, SBC to re-validate company conditions and clarify notes for DSUP, LALOC, LASN. Change status to AIR.
					5/18/01 – SBC updated the LASN LALOC conditions on the BRPOR Directory Revisions Handout. Conditions reflect relationship of LALOC and LASN with ADI and Foreign Listings.
41	(WCOM BRPOR issue #26) DSTN -- Is this truly a product difference?	WCOM	Ordering Attachment C	NR	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/11/01 - Yes this is a product difference and is tariffed. The minimum block is 20, therefore if a number is removed from a 20 number block, it must be replaced. The new number does not have to be sequential. CPUC Tariff 175T, 18.3.5.B.9 5/18/01 – Parties agree to ADC. 5/18/01 - Change to AIR for CLECs to review language changes. 5/23/01 – SBC updated Attachment C.
42	(WCOM BRPOR issue #27) LTXTY, LTY -- What about NV and IN?	WCOM	Directory Attachment C	ADC	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/3/01 – WCOM asked if there are tariff references for these two states NV, and IN? SBC clarified that these two regions also have tariffs and will update the Attachment accordingly. Parties agree to ADC.
43	(WCOM BRPOR issue #28) SIC -- What about SWB?	WCOM	Directory Attachment C	ADC	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/3/01 – SBC clarified that the SIC code is prohibited for SWBT in Attach C and then remove SWB from the data entry conditions in DL form in Uniform LSOR. Also add valid SC's to

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
					condition 1. Parties agree ADC.
44	(WCOM BRPOR issue #29) LPHRASE -- Which product/region?	WCOM	Directory Attachment C	CA	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/3/01 – SBC agreed to clarify the product difference description that it is in 13 directories but not 1. 5/15/01 – Attachment C updated with valid entries for AIT, SWBT, PB and notes that SNET does not have this product offering. 5/15/01 – Parties agree to CLOSE AGREE.
45	(WCOM BRPOR issue #30) SO -- What are the differences for each region	WCOM	Directory Attachment C	ADC	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/3/01- The description on Attach C does not state PB and needs to be reworded for clarity. Parties agree ADC.
46	(WCOM BRPOR issue #31) ISPID -- Is this really a true product difference?	WCOM	Ordering Attachment C	CA	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/11/01 - Yes this is a product difference. While the CLECs will probably only order National ISDN for new service, there are older CUSTOM ISDN accounts in PB, that the CLECs may wish to migrate. If the EU does not want to change their ISDN equipment, they would continue to operate under the CUSTOM protocol and therefore the ISPID designation will remain. That designation is as noted in the valid entries. 5/18/01 – Parties agree to CLOSE AGREE.
47	BLOCK field On Supplement Business Rules Handout for Attach D, Documentation correction to include valid values for E – "No 0+ Local" and Z – "All" Also need to change Condition for S to reflect "SC=CA and TOS=2".	Accenture	Ordering	ADC	5/1/01 – Parties agree this is a Document correction.
48	HID field CLECs would like to use 1-3 alpha for regular series hunting in SNET instead of the 1-4 numeric. Change data characteristics to be 1-4 A/N.	WCOM AT&T	Ordering	RPA	5/1/01 - SBC will consider proposing this field move to Attachment E, but will need to discuss further and will wait till we get to that attachment. 5/17/01 – SBC has identified a way to change the HID in SNET on a going forward basis to be 1-4 A/N. It is not feasible however to modify the imbedded base. Modifying to accommodate this change would require support of both HID formats by both SBC and the CLECs. While SBC sees limited value in making this change, it is open to the CLECs input. 5/18/01 – Parties agree to RPA.

#	Issue	CLEC(s)	SORT value	Curr-ent Status	SBC Response:
49	HID field On Supplement Business Rules Handout for Attach D, move the first 3 Unique Company Notes over to Unique Company Condition column. Then delete the resultant duplicate CT condition.	AT&T	Ordering	ADC	5/1/01 – This is a Document correction.
50	NC field On Supplement Business Rules Handout for Attach D, verify whether the 6th condition is on Attach C with the tariff reference. Also see how the first condition and sixth condition may clash for Michigan. SBC will also validate whether SWBT was to be included in the first Unique Company Condition.	AT&T	Ordering	AIR	5/1/01 – Under Investigation 5/17/01 – The 6th condition on Attachment D was: Required when REQTYP is T, the 2nd character of TOS is X or W and SC is MI, otherwise prohibited. This condition was not listed on Attachment C as a product or tariff difference. Upon further investigation this condition will be removed. It was originally based on the fact that in MI when the service is call transfer on PBX or DID, an NC/NCI code is needed on the service order. However, what is really required is the FIC code from the EU. For all other services needing FIC, that information is populated in the feature field. To make uniform, AIT will take in the FIC in the feature field, and derive the necessary NC/NCI code for the service order when the SC is MI and the call transfer option is ordered. The 1st condition is: Required when REQTYP is P, or T and ACT is N, T, V or ACT is C and LNA is N and CFA is populated and SC is IL, IN, MI, OH, WI, CA, NV or CT, otherwise prohibited. After further investigation, SBC has determined that the NC/NCI field would not be needed for this condition. The condition will be removed. The above information will be added to ATTACHMENT D to show that it will be made uniform. 5/18/01 – Parties clarified that the NC field will be moved to Attachment B, not D. CLECs ask whether or not there is uniformity in having to provide FIC code in the Feature field in AIT vs. other regions.